

THE HON. J. MORRISON said he thought it would be as well to state the amount of interest the Government should pay on the deposit.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) said that if the Company deposited the money an arrangement would, of course, be come to as to its investment; but the Company could invest itself. He intended to ask for the recommitment of the Bill, in order to add some words as to the manner in which the interest shall be paid, and also as to extending the modes of investing, because the Company could not get debentures or inscribed stock of this colony here. He intended to ask that the Company should be able to deposit securities of land.

Clause agreed to.

The remaining clauses were passed, and the Bill reported.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 8.40. o'clock p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 5th January, 1893, at 8 o'clock p.m.

### Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 22nd December, 1892.

Private firm carrying on business on Crown Land at Geraldton—Amendment of Dog Act (Reward for Destruction of Wild Dogs)—Police Act, 1892, Amendment Bill: Message from Legislative Council—Jury Exemption Bill: Legislative Council's Amendment—Swan River (Fremantle) Harbor Works and Tramway Bill: in committee—Bills of Sales Act Further Amendment Bill: in committee—Estimates, 1893: further considered in committee—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 7.30 p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PRIVATE FIRM CARRYING ON BUSINESS ON CROWN LANDS AT GERALDTON.

MR. TRAYLEN, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways whether a private firm was carrying on business in premises on Crown

land near the Geraldton Jetty, which premises were formerly used by Mr Keane? What rent was paid for the same? And whether the said firm contributed to the revenue of the Municipality of Geraldton in respect of the said premises?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied: A private firm does occupy a building belonging to Mr. Keane, erected by him on railway land some years since. The Municipality drew attention to the fact that no rates were paid for the building, and a notice to quit was sent to the firm in consequence. The firm has since, however, made some arrangements with the Municipality as to rates. The premises will shortly be vacated.

#### REWARD FOR DESTRUCTION OF WILD DOGS.

MR. PIESSE: I rise to move, "That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that provision should be made, by an amendment of the Dog Act, for payment of the reward for the destruction of wild dogs, on production of the scalp and ears, in addition to the tail; and also that a declaration should be made by the person producing the same." I think it will be admitted on all sides that the introduction of clause 19 into the Dog Act of 1883 has been productive of much good throughout the country districts. The payment of the reward under that clause, for the destruction of native dogs, has to a certain extent brought about the desired result, although it is much to be regretted that in many instances unprincipled persons have defrauded the revenue by bringing to justices spurious dog tails that have been ingeniously manufactured from the skin of the animal. This has come under my notice personally; I have also heard it from several justices that they have frequently had these spurious tails brought to them. As there is a possibility of justices being imposed upon, who have not such a thorough knowledge of the native dog as to enable them to distinguish a genuine tail from a spurious one, I think it is necessary that something should be done to prevent this deception; and the only way that I can see for doing it is to require the scalp and ears of the dog to be produced as well as the tail. It has been

suggested to me that in a hot climate like Kimberley and our more Northern districts, where decomposition sets in so rapidly, there may be some objection to this proposal, and that to insist upon the scalp and ears being brought in would deter persons from attempting to destroy these dogs. We all know that the tail is very easily carried, and no doubt it is the simplest method of bringing about the result we wish to bring about; but it is open to the objection I have mentioned, that it opens the door to imposition. Only a few weeks ago, in my own district, at Kojonup, I noticed some 30 spurious tails produced, and had it not been that the magistrate to whom they were brought had a thorough knowledge of the native dog, it is possible that these tails would have been accepted and the reward paid. There is another thing which I think we ought to insist upon. Under the Act as it stands there is no declaration to be made by the person producing the tails that they are genuine tails, and it is difficult to get at these fellows; and I think it is very necessary that the Act should be amended in that respect. I think we should insist upon a declaration being made before the reward is paid. It will then enable the police or the magistrates to prosecute any person who makes a false declaration. At present all that is necessary is for the magistrate to whom the tails are brought to give a certificate that he is satisfied that the tail produced is that of a wild dog, and the tails are then burnt, and there is no redress if there has been deception, except by a roundabout proceeding. I think it is very necessary that something should be done to protect the public funds from imposition. I do not think there would be any great hardship, in the Southern parts of the colony, at any rate, in insisting that those who bring in the tail of a wild dog should also bring in the scalp and ears; and I believe, if this motion were agreed to, it would have a very good result. I understand that throughout our district this native dog nuisance has been very great during the last few years, and, in order to further encourage people to destroy these pests, I think it is desirable that we should increase the reward, especially in the settled districts. If the reward were increased, I think it would

have this result: that people would be induced to make the destruction of the wild dog a business, or a living. Although 10s. may appear a high reward to pay for a dog's tail, we know that the fact remains that very few persons really make it a business to destroy these pests. I think, while everything in the country districts is languishing, in the way of sandalwood-cutting and kangaroo hunting, which this class of persons turn their attention to, it would be a very wise course to increase this reward by 5s. or 10s., especially in these central districts. Men would then be induced to take up the thing as a calling, or business, and the extermination of the native dog would very soon become an accomplished fact. There is another thing that hinges on this clause 19 of the Act which, I think, should be looked into. I believe we have already the power, to some extent, of destroying the dogs of aboriginal natives; but I do not think this power, if it exists, is much used, and we know that these dogs of the natives often become wild, and become a source of quite as much trouble and destruction to the settlers' flocks as the native dog itself. They become even more cunning than the wild dog itself; and I think something should be done to reduce the number of dogs which the natives are now allowed to keep. It is not necessary that they should keep these dogs now for hunting, and obtaining their food, and they mostly keep them for pets, and they live on the sheepowners' flocks. I do not think I need say any more in support of this motion. I hope it will commend itself to the favorable consideration of members, and if the Government cannot see their way to bring in an amendment of the Act this session, I hope they will give the subject their attention during the recess. There are other clauses of the Act which I think require amending, and I trust the Government will consider the matter.

MR. HASSELL: I rise to support the motion of the hon. member for the Williams, because I know that, at present, justices are sometimes imposed upon, or at any rate that attempts are made to impose upon them. Some time ago a man brought to a justice of the peace at Albany 35 dogs' tails, out of which I think 27 were manufactured

tails, and very ingeniously manufactured they were. This gentleman, who was a town resident, and did not know much about the native dog, brought the tails to me, and I saw at once that some of them were manufactured tails and others were not the tails of native dogs at all. I think it is very necessary that some further precautions should be taken, and that a declaration should accompany the tails sent in. The justices in Albany thought the man who brought in those 27 spurious tails should be prosecuted, and they put them in the hands of the police, but I believe it was found that there was no provision in the Act for punishing a man for substituting false tails for genuine ones.

MR. SIMPSON: I have much pleasure in supporting the remarks of the hon. member for the Williams in regard to the absolute nuisance that is caused from the number of dogs which the natives keep. They are absolutely a perfect pest. I have heard complaints about them in all parts of the colony, and I have myself seen native gins travelling about with nine or ten hungry mongrels of dogs at their heels. I believe that by a careful system of propagation these dogs eventually produce a considerable increase in the amount which the Government is called upon to pay in rewards for the destruction of the wild dog. I think the hon. member who moved this motion in the direction of amending the present Dog Act would have done a useful thing if he had moved for its amendment in this respect: that the public should have the right to shoot every dog belonging to a native, except one. I think they might be allowed to keep one, but when it comes to every native woman keeping a pack of these dogs it is about time we should interfere.

MR. RICHARDSON: I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion, to a certain extent. I am not quite so sure that there is the amount of fraud and imposition which the hon. member makes out with regard to this tail business. There may be—I don't know, but there may be justices who can be imposed upon in this way—but it does not speak much for the acuteness of a man's intelligence or faculties of perception if he cannot determine whether a tail is a manufactured one or the genuine article.

I am inclined to think that if a circular were issued to magistrates cautioning them, and requesting them to use greater vigilance, it would probably have some effect. I agree with the hon. member that there should be a declaration. I think the person who brings in the tails and seeks to obtain the reward should be required to make a solemn declaration that they are the tails of native dogs. As to bringing in the scalp and ears, I think there may be some difficulty about that in warm climates, where decomposition sets in very rapidly. I am afraid that the unfortunate dog-hunter would often be done out of his reward altogether. With regard to the hon. member's suggestion that the amount of the reward should be increased, I wish to give him my most cordial support. I think the time has arrived when it would be wise policy on the part of the Government, and one that in the end would result in economy, if they were to increase the reward. When native dogs are plentiful, perhaps 10s. is sufficient inducement to persons to track them up and destroy them, but, when their number is considerably diminished, they are too difficult to get them to make it worth a man's while to waste much trouble over them; and the consequence is they are left alone to their own devices until they again become sufficiently plentiful to encourage the pursuit of them. The result is, there is no finality about the thing, and we shall never see the end of this reward fund. On the other hand, if the Government increased the reward from 10s. to £1—although at first there would be an increased charge upon the revenue,—I am sure that eventually there would be a saving. Their breeding camps would be destroyed, for the hunters would seek them out in their own haunts. It may be said that the settlers themselves should undertake the extermination of these pests. That is just where the difficulty comes in. The settlers do a great deal in this direction; in fact, I have myself offered £1 for every tail, in addition to the 10s. offered by the Government, and many other settlers do the same. But that does not overcome the difficulty. It is in the waste lands of the Crown and the fastnesses of the hills, where they breed, that they ought to be pursued; and, if the Government reward were in-

creased, they would be followed to their breeding haunts, and eventually be exterminated. There are many reasons why it is most desirable that we should get rid of this pest, not only in the interests of large flockowners, but also in the interests of small farmers. We profess to be very anxious to encourage small farmers to keep a few sheep. I believe, myself, that farming in this colony cannot be prosecuted with any degree of profit and success, especially by small farmers, without a certain proportion of sheep. But whenever I have urged this upon our small farmers I have always been met by this argument: "What is the use of our trying to keep sheep when the wild dogs are such a nuisance; we cannot afford, in our small way, to keep a shepherd, and it is no use attempting it and lose the few sheep you have." These men become discouraged, and eventually abandon all idea of keeping sheep while the native dog nuisance remains what it is. From this point of view, too, I think it would be wise policy on the part of the Government to increase the reward, and make more vigorous efforts to extirpate this pest. As we are all anxious—and the present Government especially—to encourage small homestead farming, which is rendered practically impossible by this cursed nuisance of wild dogs, I think we should make every effort to get rid of the nuisance; and I believe that if the reward were increased to £1 we should see an end of this difficulty in two or three years.

MR. CLARKSON: I also have very much pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for the Williams. I cannot say, so far as my own experience goes, that I have seen any attempt to substitute manufactured tails for the genuine article, but I believe it is a fact that it has been attempted, and, I believe, in some cases, carried out. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for the DeGrey that the time has arrived when this reward should be increased. We must remember that the keeping of a few sheep, now-a-days, is essential to success in farming, and that the small farmer who has not a few sheep in his paddocks, to supply himself with meat and to turn a little profit in other ways, is not likely to make much headway; and we know that many farmers are

deterred from attempting to keep sheep because of this native dog nuisance. A reward of 10s. for a dog's tail may at first sight appear a liberal reward; but it is not sufficient to induce men to make a trade of it. We have in this colony, unfortunately, large areas of land unsuitable for carrying stock, owing to poison and other drawbacks, and these native dogs breed in this wild, scrubby country, and come in every now and then into the settled and paddocked country, causing great destruction. The present reward is not sufficient to induce hunters to go into this scrubby country, and I should be glad to see the reward increased to £1. People in town have no idea of the havoc made by these dogs, among sheep. I have known, in one year, in my own district, a farmer losing 300 sheep in three months through these wild dogs. I quite agree with the hon. member that the scalp should be produced as well as the tail, and that it should be incumbent upon the producer to make a declaration. I think we should offer a liberal reward, but should also take every precaution against fraud. Of course, all magistrates are not thoroughly acquainted with the appearance of a native dog, although it does seem almost incredible that any intelligent man should be taken in by a manufactured tail. But it appears there are some who are imposed upon, and we should take every care that these frauds are not easily perpetrated. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I also shall have much pleasure in supporting this motion. I think there was a great deal of wisdom in the remarks of the hon. member who brought it forward. There is no doubt that the colony, if we are to believe all we hear—and I have no doubt it is true, a great portion of it—there is no doubt that the colony is defrauded out of considerable sums of money by the imposition referred to, by the manufacturing of tails from the skins of native dogs. I think, if the suggestion of the hon. member for the Williams were carried out, it would prevent this being done. The hon. member for the DeGrey seems to think that there is no difficulty in distinguishing a wild dog's tail from a tame dog's tail. That may be so, but there is a great difficulty in distinguishing the tail of a

tame dog's puppy from the tail of a wild dog's puppy. I saw one myself the other day, and I was unable to distinguish whether it was the tail of a tame dog's puppy or of a wild dog's puppy. I have also heard—of course I do not know whether it is a fact—but I have heard of a tail being cut off and the puppy being afterwards allowed to go. I do not think that the present reward, 10s., is a large amount, but I would extend it to the Northern districts, where the reward now is only 5s. There is a very great difficulty now in grappling with this native difficulty in those districts, where these dogs are becoming very cunning, and there is the greatest trouble in capturing them. I think the time has now arrived when the reward in the Northern districts should be increased,—in the Kimberley district especially, where they are very troublesome. They kill thousands of sheep, and there is the greatest difficulty imaginable in capturing or destroying them. You cannot induce them to take baits. Only the other day I saw a letter which stated that the native dogs had destroyed some thousands of sheep in the Kimberley district. I think if the reward were increased in these Northern districts it would be an inducement to people to use a little more energy and vigilance, and spend a little more time, in endeavoring to capture these dogs. They are not very numerous, but they are very difficult to get hold of. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

MR. LEFROY: I am in entire sympathy with the object and intention of the hon. member for the Williams in this matter, but I feel doubtful whether it will have the desired result. I cannot agree altogether with that part of the motion which provides for the production of the scalp and ears of native dogs; I am afraid there would be a great deal of trouble and difficulty in bringing in these scalps from long distances, in a climate like ours. Moreover, the ears and scalp, when they get dry, resemble very much the ears and scalp of tame dogs. But if the person producing the tails of these dogs were obliged to make a declaration before the justice to whom he brought them, and there was a penalty for making a false declaration, I think it would meet the case. I do not know that there is

much money actually lost to the State in this way, and I do not think there is. I have myself seen spurious tails brought in; in fact, not long ago a young man had the audacity to bring me a cat's tail, and asked me to pass it as a wild dog's tail, but I do not think he will bring me any more cats' tails. In all probability, had he known that I was going to become a member of this Assembly, I do not suppose he would have tried to impose on me as he did. Some of the tails he brought in were genuine tails, but I told him I would not certify to any of them, as he had endeavored to hoodwink me, and I accepted none of them, and that young man went without his reward. I know that justices as a rule are very particular before certifying to these wild dogs' tails, and I should imagine that any justice, if he was a sensible man, and could not himself detect the difference, would, if he had any doubt about the genuineness of the tails, take them to somebody who could tell the difference, before he gave his certificate. As to the policy of the State offering these rewards, I know there is a general impression amongst people in town that it is entirely for the benefit of the country people; but, I think if you come to analyse it, it will be seen that it is for the benefit of the colony at large that these wild dogs should be destroyed. For every native dog that is killed, there are so many sheep saved to the colony, and every sheep saved represents a certain amount of wealth, not only in mutton but also in wool. And as our wool is one of our most valuable colonial products, it is obviously to the benefit of the country that the number of our sheep should not be diminished by wild dogs. These pests are very difficult indeed to cope with. We are situated very differently here from what sheepfarmers are in many countries; we have a large extent of unoccupied waste land, which affords a harbor for these wild dogs. Though it may be urged that the settlers themselves should destroy these dogs—and we have endeavored to do so on our runs—the fact of the matter is that there is so much waste country between the settlers' runs that it is impossible for the settlers themselves to cope with the difficulty. But by increasing the Government reward, people might be induced to go out

hunting these native dogs in these waste lands. I do not believe that any measure that has been introduced here for the benefit of the country settlers has done more good than this provision in the Dog Act, offering a reward for the destruction of native dogs. Some remarks were made by the hon. member for Geraldton with regard to the dogs of natives. No doubt these animals are a great pest, but I do not think my hon. friend is aware that the present Act makes provision for the destruction of these dogs. I believe that under the Act no native is allowed to keep more than one dog, and there is power given to the police to destroy any other dogs belonging to a native. I do not think that provision is generally enforced as it ought to be, and I think the police should be instructed by the head of the department to enforce it more stringently. If they did, the nuisance complained of by the hon. member would be very largely abated. These dogs are not actually required by the natives; they simply keep them for—goodness knows what; I don't know.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): As a friend.

MR. LEFROY: As friends, possibly; but I should think that one dog as a friend is quite sufficient. They do not require these dogs for hunting game now, for, as a rule, they live upon the settlers, and get their food from them. Although the question of increasing the reward has been considerably discussed, there is nothing in the motion before the House about increasing the reward, and I should like to move an amendment providing for an increased reward being offered, also omitting that portion of the motion which makes the production of the scalp and ears compulsory. I do not think this will be defeating the object of this motion, for our great object is to get rid of these wild dogs; and I am afraid, if we compel people to produce the scalp and ears, we shall defeat the object we have in view, by surrounding it with such difficulty that people will not be inclined to go to the trouble of destroying these dogs. I think that country justices, as a rule, are quite capable of detecting the difference between false tails and genuine tails, and that there is no necessity for insisting upon the production of the scalp and ears as well.

MR. COOKWORTHY: I suppose the object of the reward is to endeavor to exterminate these dogs, but I really think, if this motion is carried, it will tend to just the very reverse; because, just look at the facts: a man living, say, some 20, or 30, or 40 miles away from a magistrate, kills a wild dog, cuts off its tail, and puts it on one side until he gets two or three more, and has an opportunity of taking them in to the magistrate. The tail is not much injured by keeping, but the scalp and ears, I should say, would be utterly unfit for production if kept in the same way, and the result would be, that man would not trouble himself about destroying these dogs for the sake of the reward. I really think it would be a mistake to introduce this provision. After all, I really do not think that any great amount of falsification ever does take place,—certainly not successfully. I should think any man with a little common sense and discrimination could detect a natural tail from one made up. I know they have been made up, but the fraud was discovered.

MR. CANNING: Most members who are acquainted with the bush and pastoral pursuits know that native dogs are a very great nuisance, and that a great deal might be done by owners of stations to extirpate them. At the same time it may be a very great help in extirpating them if the Government were to give a reward, and, under the present state of the law, I believe that is done. But it appears that abuses have arisen in connection with that system of giving rewards by the Government. With regard to that, I submit (under correction of the Attorney General) that the present state of law is quite sufficient to reach abuses of that kind. I think that if a man brought me, as a magistrate, a number of tails, say 20, representing them as native dogs' tails, and claimed the reward, and induced me to give him a certificate entitling him to the reward, and if, say, 10 of those tails turned out to be spurious, that man could be prosecuted for fraud—for obtaining money from me under false pretences. I think the present law would enable me to reach that man just as effectually as if the law were altered as suggested. I think all that is necessary is that justices should pay the reward,

and, if it is discovered that there has been fraud, that the most stringent measures be taken to punish such fraud. It is a contemptible and wretched kind of fraud, and I think the law should be put in motion most stringently, which is all that is required. With regard to destroying the dogs of natives, I should hardly be prepared to assent to any authorisation of the indiscriminate shooting of these dogs. I think that the law at present gives power to the police to destroy these dogs. It is only on rare occasions that they become a nuisance—when you happen to pass a native camp. They do not bring them into town, as a rule. If people were allowed to shoot the dogs of the natives indiscriminately, they might occasionally make a mistake and shoot the natives themselves. I think the present state of the law is sufficient for all purposes.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** The hon. member for the Williams has brought forward this motion with one object, that is, to prevent persons from defrauding the revenue, and that greater precautions should be taken to prevent their doing so. I am inclined to think, notwithstanding what has been said by some members, that the existence of this practice of attempting to defraud the revenue cannot be very prevalent throughout the colony. One or two members have told us they have had it brought under their notice, but I think that as a rule there is not much done in that direction, because most of these tails are sent to justices who live in the country, and who are therefore well acquainted—

**MR. HASSELL:** They are taken in to town justices also.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** It may be at Albany; but, generally, they are sent in to country justices, who are acquainted with the native dog, and who are not likely to be taken in to any large extent. There is considerable activity now throughout the colony in the destruction of these native dogs, and, though not exterminated, still immense numbers of them have been destroyed. Last year we paid £1,660 18s. 6d. in rewards. I have not had an opportunity of seeing how many were killed in the Northern and Eastern, and how many in the Southern parts; but, if we assume that one-half the number were killed in

the South-West division and the other half in the Northern and Eastern divisions (the pastoral districts of the colony), we would find that something like 5,000 dogs were killed last year. About the same number must have been killed the year before, and I expect if we looked back we should find that the same thing had been going on for many years past, judging by the amount paid in rewards. Therefore, either one thing or the other must happen: either these dogs increase at a very rapid rate, or else they are being rapidly exterminated. I am inclined to think the latter is the fact, and that this terrible pest is being exterminated pretty rapidly, in most districts. I think that in the Nor'-West its existence is not very troublesome. These dogs are not very numerous up there. It is open country as a rule, which the wild dog does not care for, and the settlers are his great enemy—and he is a great enemy of theirs too; but I think he has almost disappeared, at any rate in the older settled portions. Altogether, I do not think we could fairly ask the Legislature to provide a greater sum under this head than we are now voting. The only part of this resolution which I think the Government might take some means of looking into is that relating to making it an offence to present to any justice a dog's tail which is not a genuine one, with a view of obtaining a reward. I should have thought that the law would be strong and far-reaching enough to reach such persons now. But there may be difficulties. The man might plead ignorance, that he got the tails from somebody else, and other excuses. But, even if there were some special enactment it might be difficult to cope with the cunning of some people. Altogether, I am inclined to ask the hon. member, having now drawn attention to the matter, to withdraw his resolution. I do not think much good would come out of insisting upon the scalp and ears being produced. In the first place, it would give very great trouble and inconvenience to those who destroy these dogs to have to bring in their scalp and ears, and I think it would act as a deterrent rather than an incentive to their destruction. On the whole, I really think no great good would result if we passed this motion. I have no objection to it personally; in

fact, it has my sympathy, because the only object is to prevent fraud upon the revenue of the colony. But I really think we may trust, as a body at any rate, the justices of the colony in this matter. They are, as a rule, practical men, acquainted with this animal we want to destroy; and, if in a few cases they are taken in—well—it is the same in everything. We are all taken in now and again; and I do not know, even if this motion were agreed to, and every means were provided against imposition, but that occasional attempts would be made to impose upon some gentlemen who are magistrates. Altogether, I would advise the hon. member, having drawn attention to the matter, to withdraw his motion. If there is any way he can suggest to me that I can assist magistrates in guarding against these impositions, either by circular instructing them to exercise greater vigilance, or otherwise, I shall be very glad to do it.

MR. PIESSE: As to instructing magistrates by circular, I do not think that would have any good effect, as we should still have these cunning people resorting to the same tricks, and, unless we insist upon a declaration, followed by punishment in the event of its being a false declaration, I do not see how we are to get at the evil. As to the hon. member for East Perth's remarks with regard to its being a difficult matter to deceive any magistrate with these tails, I may tell him that those who have had much larger experience than town members are some times deceived, and find very great difficulty in detecting these spurious tails; they are so cleverly made up. These false tails are generally mixed up with a lot of genuine tails, and—

MR. CANNING: If the hon. member will pardon me, he did not quite follow my remarks. I did not make any observation as to there being no difficulty for a magistrate in distinguishing between spurious and genuine tails, but that a magistrate who found he had been imposed upon had a right, and it would be his duty, to prosecute any person who attempted to palm off a spurious tail as a genuine tail upon him.

MR. PIESSE: When a magistrate gives a certificate he is of course satisfied that the tails are genuine, and the tails are then destroyed in his presence, and

there's an end of them. What we want to bring about is some means of deterring these persons from attempting these impositions and defrauding the revenue. It is all very well to say there can't be much of this kind of work going on, and that it is not worth talking about. I can assure hon. members it is carried out to a greater extent in some districts than they imagine. There are people who make a practice of it, and who are "marked" and suspected, and with whom it is always necessary to exercise the utmost vigilance. Even the Chinese are now defrauding the revenue in this way, in some districts that I know. Although perhaps the production of the scalp and ears might not have the desired effect, still, at the same time, I do think that a declaration should be made, so that we could get at these people if they made a false declaration. Although the intention of the Premier as to issuing circulars to magistrates may be good, and might have some effect in some instances; still there are magistrates who would be likely to be deceived, unless we insist upon a declaration from the person bringing in the tails. However, if the subject will receive the attention of the Government, as the Premier says—although I still think the Act should be amended in this respect—and, if it is the wish of the House, I shall be content to withdraw my resolution, if the Premier assures me that the Government will consider the matter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I should like to say a few words on this motion before it is withdrawn, not because I know much about the tail of a dog, either wild or tame. I never kept a dog in my life, and I hope I never shall. But as to making people who kill native dogs to bring in their scalps and ears, it strikes me that would simply defeat the very object we have in view. We know, most of us, that people in country districts who make a practice of destroying these dogs for the sake of the reward do not bring in the tail as soon as the dog is killed; they generally keep them until they have a good stock of them. This may not lead to very disagreeable results as regards the tail, but I fancy it would not be a pleasant thing to have to keep a lot of scalps and ears for an indefinite period in a hot climate



like this. Therefore, I say the proposed remedy would be more likely to defeat the object in view than to assist it. I should have thought, too, that with the exercise of very little ingenuity you could make a dog's ear out of the dog's skin, or some other part, just as easily as you could make something to represent a dog's tail—easier, I should think, by having a mould and cutting out the ear the right shape. Therefore, I do not think that would better the position in any sense. The complaint of the hon. member for the Williams, and the complaint of everyone who spoke, seems to be that some evil-disposed persons attempt to delude our worthy magistrates in the country by palming off upon them made-up tails instead of the genuine article. Well, such attempts may be made, but I have not heard a single assertion that any attempts of the kind have succeeded, or that a magistrate has ever actually accepted and passed a spurious tail for a genuine one, though Chinamen and others may attempt to induce them to do so. It seems they are always found out. I believe I preside over the magistrates of this colony, as their Ministerial head, and if I thought there were magistrates in Western Australia who could not tell a genuine dog's tail from a spurious one—well—I think I should have something to say to those magistrates, for certainly they are entrusted with the decision of matters far more difficult than that. But none of the country members tell us that any magistrate has yet been actually taken in. If a magistrate thinks the man who brings him a tail has a roguish look about him, what is easier than to tell him that he is not satisfied that it is a dog's tail? Then the man does not get the reward. The Act says the magistrate must be satisfied, and, if he is not satisfied, there is no reward. If the hon. member thinks there is any virtue in a statutory declaration—which I do not myself, any more than in an affidavit—the magistrate could always ask the man to make a statutory declaration; and, if it should be found false, that justice would be the very last man to prosecute that man. In any case, I do not think that if we alter the law a statutory declaration is likely to make a spurious tail into a genuine one. My advice is to leave the matter as

it is, and let magistrates exercise a little common sense, which, so far as I can make out, has always hitherto defeated the man with the spurious tail.

MR. PIESSE: It is all nonsense saying that the revenue has not been defrauded in this way. I have heard many people say they have done it. Having, however, brought the matter now under the notice of the Government, and, with the assurance given by the Premier, and after the remarks by the Attorney General, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### POLICE ACT, 1892, AMENDMENT BILL.

##### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

*Mr. Speaker,*

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled "An Act to amend 'The Police Act, 1892,'" subject to the amendments contained in the Schedule annexed, in which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

GEO. SHENTON,

President.

Legislative Council Chamber,

Perth, December 22nd, 1892.

*Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Council in the "Police Act Amendment Bill."*

No. 1—On page 2, strike out clause 4.

No. 2—On page 5, clause 15, lines 2 and 4, after the word "cattle," insert "or dog."

C. LEE STEERE,

Clerk of Council.

Ordered—That the consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's Message No. 10 be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

#### JURY EXEMPTION BILL.

##### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

The House went into committee for the consideration of the amendment made by the Legislative Council in this Bill.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

The amendment proposed by the Legislative Council was read, and was as follows:—On page 1, clause 1, line 8

strike out "under," and insert "solely and exclusively in," in lieu thereof.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved that the amendment be agreed to. The object in view was to limit the exemption, as regards public officers, to those exclusively employed in the Government Service.

Question—put and passed.

Resolution to be reported.

MR. SPEAKER took the chair.

MR. CANNING reported that the committee had considered the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council in the Jury Exemption Bill, and had agreed to the same.

Ordered—That a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council, informing them that the Assembly had agreed to their amendment.

#### SWAN RIVER (FREMANTLE) HARBOR WORKS AND TRAMWAY BILL.

This Bill passed through committee without comment or amendment.

#### BILLS OF SALE ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

This Bill passed through committee *sub silentio*.

#### ESTIMATES, 1893.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

Debate upon Sir JOHN FORREST'S motion, That the first vote, "His Excellency the Governor," stand at £373 10s.—continued:

MR. DEHAMEL: Sir, I rise under serious disadvantages to open the debate on the Budget speech which we had the privilege of listening to last night. I say under serious disadvantages, because I have not had much time to consider these Estimates, or to consider the remarks that were made by the Colonial Treasurer. I am sorry I am not a sort of talking machine that is capable of being wound up, and of pouring out a stream of words until it has run down again; and I do not like to detain members with remarks upon a subject which I have not had had an opportunity of sufficiently thinking out. At the same time, having put my hand to the plough it is not my intention to turn back. I shall not, however, be able to go so fully into this matter as I should have liked to have

done if the time at my disposal had been longer. But, with a little extra indulgence, perhaps, from hon. members on this occasion I may be able to put before them the view I hold of the Budget speech we listened to last night. It appears to me, sir, that this speech was one of the most extraordinary speeches, in one or two respects—to which I will refer presently—that it has been my lot to listen to, either here or in any other House. The speech itself seems to have been divided into some six parts, commencing first with certain details as to the population, then as to last year's expenditure, and then as to the general indebtedness of the colony. That was followed by some remarks on our imports and exports, and then we really come to the *crux* of the Budget speech, which consisted of the remarks of the Colonial Treasurer with reference to the proposed expenditure. The speech then wound up with suggesting a further loan which will have to be raised, coupled with a reference to some proposals in regard to the Midland Railway. What the Midland Railway has to do with the Budget speech or with the Estimates, I am certainly at a loss to understand. Now, throughout the whole of this speech I observe one monotonous, sort of Irish banshee, wail,—one mournful note of impending disaster, again and again repeated. That note is this: that though we can easily provide £139,000 to meet the interest and sinking fund in connection with our loans for public works, we shall have to wait some years before obtaining the benefits which we expect to receive from this expenditure upon public works. It appears to me that this, after all, is but a neat way of saying that even on the works constructed under our present loan there will be very great losses for us to meet, very great losses for us to encounter in the near future. But not only this, we are told that another £500,000—half a million of money—will be required to enable the Government to complete these works before people can expect to receive any of those benefits that we look forward to receive from them; and, also, though enjoying some present "transitory prosperity" whilst this loan money is being expended, the benefits we look for cannot possibly accrue until

a considerable time after the completion of those works. It is a sorry look-out for the colony indeed that; because, where even this "transitory prosperity" is at the present moment I think every member of this House would have great difficulty to find out. There is no "transitory prosperity" in Perth at the present time, and none in Fremantle, and certainly none down South way, for at Albany things have not been so bad for the last twenty years. So that even in the very flush of the expenditure of these loan moneys we find we have not even that transitory prosperity we ought to have in consideration of the money so being expended. I therefore quite agree that we shall have to wait, and to wait a long time, before we receive those benefits which the Treasurer holds out as likely to accrue some time or the other. I entirely agree with him in that. I will only add that when these works are completed we shall then begin to enjoy, not those benefits and those blessings which the Treasurer looks forward to, but the losses in working expenses that must accrue upon the first working of these new undertakings—a subject which members must have noticed the Treasurer was very careful not to mention, a subject on which he was very careful to maintain a most discreet silence. After proceeding thus far, we seem to come to a pyrotechnic display of oratorical effects, combined with some startling truisms. I must certainly congratulate the hon. gentleman upon his marvellous perspicacity in the discovery of one or two of these fundamental truths. I can hardly believe it when I look through my notes and find the great discoveries he has made. He told us that we are losing one-half the good that our loans would do us if we produced all we required in this colony; and he followed up that startling truism by another absolutely novel proposition, that if we could borrow all we want from our own people instead of going to a foreign market, if we could buy all our rolling stock and our rails from our own people, then what would be the result? Our condition would be very different from what it is now. Why, sir, such a discovery absolutely takes one's breath away. Such truisms seem to me to be perfectly marvellous. If we only could raise our loans among our own people,

and spend all the money in the colony, sending none of it out of the colony, we should be in a different position from what we are in now. I think that my hon. friend the Premier has in this instance really taken his first simple step in statesmanship, and I cannot help thinking that it was this great discovery which apparently frightened or alarmed him in the course of his speech. But there is also a serious side to the remarks made by the Premier on this point. He told us that we have to borrow our money in another market, that we have to send away the money to pay the interest on this money, and that we have to spend much of what we borrow amongst those who lend it to us, and that this must continue for some time. I quite agree with this. But, certainly, I hardly expected to hear these arguments fall from the head of the Government, for they appear to me to be about the most damning arguments that could possibly be used as to the wisdom of this wonderfully abortive Loan policy we have indulged in so long. He then proceeded to treat us to some interesting disquisitions, obviously the outcome of some of the hon. gentleman's midnight musings, with reference to the money which the people of the colony have on deposit and at call in the Banks. After carefully considering what the Premier said on that point, it appears to me that his midnight musings, after all, came to very little indeed. It appears that the Banks have some £500,000 at call—that is about £9 per head of the population; and about £600,000 on fixed deposit, which would be about £11 per head of the population. The Premier has been puzzling his brain to know where ever all this money can come from. He says he often wonders whose it all is. He says he has none, and that none of his friends have any. Really, anyone would imagine that the Premier of the colony seriously deprecated the idea of people saving up and hoarding their money in the Banks like this. I am rather inclined to think that those who put their money safely away in the Banks are a great deal wiser than those who put it into gold mines, and other speculations of that sort. I think those who have their money in the Bank know it is in safe keeping, while, as to the money that is put into gold mines, no one knows

where it goes to. But I cannot find, after considering all the Premier said, that he really suggested or gave any reason why these amounts should not stand in the Banks. He did not suggest what else ought to be done with them. His midnight lucubrations really seemed to me to come to nothing. They simply seemed to me to indicate that his mind is troubled about all these matters, and hence this continuous wail of impending disaster which we find throughout the whole of his speech. It also appears to me that most of the other Ministers are somewhat perturbed in their minds, and I am not at all surprised at it, having regard to the ground for it that is shown in this Budget speech. It was only the other night that the Minister for Railways told us that he lost his sleep owing to the fearful responsibilities which surround him in his office. I suppose he has nightly dreams of railway disasters around his bed. The Premier, too, apparently loses his rest through these midnight musings over impending disasters. It appears to me that this loss of rest tells a tale, and that Ministers are not altogether easy in their minds as to the way in which the affairs of the colony are progressing. I think they begin to feel that the country is drifting somewhat into difficulties, and that they are beginning to feel that the day is not far distant when they will have to face a failure, or a partial failure at any rate, of this their great Loan policy. That seemed to me to be the only thing that the Budget speech warranted us in believing. If you boil it down or submit it to analytic process, possibly you will find a residuum of these few facts alone: first, that since the introduction of Responsible Government we have expended a sum of £900,000 on public works, the greater portion of that having been expended during the last three months.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): £900,000?

MR. DEHAMEL: £370,000 before September, and since September our expenditure has been at a much heavier rate.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think I said that not more than £400,000 had been spent out of the £900,000 raised. We have not got it all yet.

MR. DEHAMEL: The statement is this—I cannot give the exact figures—that £373,000 was expended up to September last, and that since September last we have been spending money at a very greatly increased rate.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That won't make up £900,000, will it?

MR. DEHAMEL: I also took it that the balance of this loan will have to be called up very shortly, and, in the same way, be very shortly expended. And, not only so, but that we shall also require a further half a million in order to complete the public works that are already in hand. The Premier assured us also that he had little fear of our income enabling us to meet the interest and sinking fund on our loans to date. The amount he gave us was £140,000. I have no reason to quarrel with his opinion as to that amount being met by revenue, as he anticipates. But he did not seem to speak in the same confident way with regard to the additional £30,000 or so that will have to be met on our borrowing this further proposed sum of £500,000. That would make the amount, roughly, £165,000 to £170,000 that will have to be met out of current revenue every year to pay interest and provide sinking fund for our loans. That is the liability, then, we have to face, irrespective of any losses on the working of our railways and other public works. But when we turn to the question of our income, I tell you it is very discouraging, very disappointing. We find that our imports are failing; and imports failing simply means this, that there is a loss of Customs revenue to the colony. We were also told that our exports were failing; and, though that may not be a direct loss to the revenue, it is a direct loss to the community at large.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Our Customs revenue increased last year.

MR. DEHAMEL: I am only taking the hon. gentleman's statement last night.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I said that the Customs revenue this year was over £20,000 more than the estimated revenue.

MR. DEHAMEL: The hon. gentleman did say that, but he also told us that these increased imports were to a large extent ephemeral, and were due in a great

measure to the importation of material for the Midland Railway.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I never mentioned the subject.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The Midland Railway material comes in free of duty, and therefore cannot affect the revenue in the slightest degree.

MR. DEHAMEL: The Premier also mentioned, in regard to our exports, that, in spite of an addition of £200,000 from the exportation of gold—which was £85,000 in excess of last year—our exports this year will not be equal in amount to the exports of last year. It seems to me, therefore, that we have got on the one hand a very largely growing expenditure, while on the other hand we have, even on the Budget speech itself, a great falling off in the revenue with which we have to meet that expenditure. Therefore, I am not surprised that the Treasurer did say something to this effect: that this disproportion between our imports and exports is a subject deserving our serious attention, and that great efforts must be made to alter this unsatisfactory state of things. I entirely agree with the Premier in that; and that was one of the points that, last session, I and others raised in this House—the necessity for bringing our exports more into proportion with our imports. But the Attorney General took exception to that doctrine, and rather ridiculed all those who on this side of the House looked upon an excess of imports over exports as a detriment to the colony. The Attorney General assured us, and read out of a shilling handbook of the Cobden Club, a paragraph to show, that where the imports of a country exceeded its exports, it was a sure sign of the immense prosperity of that country. I am glad to see that the Treasurer, at any rate, has at last taken a different view, and has decided to come round to the creed of the Opposition, on this important point at all events. There was one part of his Budget speech in which the Premier did claim one little bit of credit for his Government, and that was because they had spent £50,000 less last year than they had been authorised to spend by this House. He said, referring to this: “I do not think it can “ therefore be said that we were reckless ;

“on the other hand, I think this result “shows great care and economy.” When the Premier got this far, I fully expected to hear him say that all this saving was due to our public works having been constructed so much under the estimated cost; but, almost in the next breath, he went on and told us that the reason why this money had not been expended was because the Works Department had not been able to get the work done. That was certainly, to my mind, a very funny position for the Premier to take up—to claim credit for economy and for not expending money on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to admit that the reason why the money was not expended was because the Government had not been in a position to spend it. There was one significant omission I noticed—and members generally must have noticed it—in the Premier's speech, and that was that not one single word was said about any revision of the tariff. I believe myself that the Government feel that we are face to face with those difficulties that I pointed out a few minutes ago, and that they feel they will be unable to effect any revision of the tariff without at the same time providing revenue by some other mode of taxation. But this question of the tariff is one that ought to be considered, and ought to be speedily considered; and I am extremely sorry that on this occasion we heard nothing at all about it. But, though there was no reference to the tariff in the Budget speech, we had reference to two things which certainly did puzzle me, namely, the mysterious reference to a future loan of £500,000, and the reference to those Midland Railway proposals which will have to come before us this session—not on the Estimates, but on a separate Bill. I could not imagine why the Premier should have gone out of his way to bring before us, in his speech last night, matters which really had nothing whatever to do with the subject in hand. The Premier claims, and certainly claims truly up to the present, that, so far, his Government have not landed the colony in any disaster with regard to borrowing and the expenditure of the moneys we have borrowed, or are authorised to borrow. In that I agree. So far we are free and clear of all financial disasters. I am not afraid of the interest and or-

dinary expenditure, but what I am afraid of is the losses on the working of these new lines of railway and other public works when completed; and this is a point on which the Treasurer, in his Budget speech, maintained such a masterly silence. I think I have now pointed out the main points that occur to me on the speech; it does not show to me that happy state of things I should like to have seen, and I do not think I should do any good by addressing the House any further upon it.

MR. RICHARDSON: As nobody seems anxious to enter upon any elaborate criticism of the Budget Speech we had the pleasure of listening to last evening, or to continue the debate, I should like just to say a few words. I certainly thought, when the hon. member for Albany commenced his remarks, he was going to give us a dose of it, but he seems to have cut it short; and, so far as his criticism goes, I really cannot see anything in it. There really is nothing in what the hon. member said, if you boil it all down. He seemed to have taken much delight in criticising certain remarks made by some of us on this side of the House, and particularly the Attorney General, last session, and in laying the flattering unction to his soul that he had converted the Premier to his own way of thinking, that where a nation's imports are in excess of its exports that nation or country is doomed to destruction. If that be so, then England must be in a very bad way, for her imports very largely exceed her exports. After all, this vexed question of the relative value of a country's imports and exports is a very unsafe index of a nation's prosperity. There are so many different conditions to be taken into consideration, and they become so mixed, that nobody can safely look upon them as a safe indication of a country's prosperity or the reverse. One country may be more self-containing and more self-sustaining than another. Within the boundaries of her own territory she may be able to produce or manufacture nearly everything of what she requires. In that case both the imports and exports would appear very small indeed, while at the same time the people of that country might be in a very comfortable and happy state. Or it may be that a country is, like ourselves, simply a producer of

raw materials, and in that case the value of her exports might afford some index of its position; but whether the fact that our imports at present exceed our exports is an index that we are in a bad state of depression is a different matter. I do not think it can be said, for it must be remembered that, while we are borrowing money, all that money comes into the country in the shape of imports. Nobody is so stupid as to think it comes here in bullion. No one heard of such a thing in international trade. If a country borrows a million of money, it comes to it in imports, and it shows itself in the excessive imports of that nation. The whole question is so threadbare that it really does not call for more than a passing comment. With reference to the Budget speech, I think, sir, that so far from being one continuous wail of misfortune and impending disaster, as the hon. member for Albany would make out, it rather disclosed a condition of affairs which may be best described as being of a mixed nature. Some parts of the speech certainly afforded subject for congratulation; other parts were not so hopeful as we could wish. They all might have been of a more hopeful nature, perhaps, and no doubt the Premier himself wished most heartily that they were so. At any rate I think he showed an honest intention in not keeping back those parts that did not afford so pleasant a prospect as we could wish. I think, perhaps, the chief item of distrust in the whole of his statement was the immense falling off in our wool exports. This, at any rate, was not an unexpected falling off. Those of us who had some acquaintance with the subject fully anticipated it, and we were branded as croakers, and all that sort of thing for doing so. Of course it has turned out as we anticipated. At the same time I think, though there may be a great deal of wool yet to be shipped, it is probable that our export under this head will not be much more than about half what it was in former years. Still, I believe it will show an increase on what the Premier led us to believe,—at any rate, I hope so, for it is our wool exports that help to enable us to provide for the interest on our loans; and if this staple export of the country were to fall off very largely we should be in a bad way no doubt. But I certainly do take exception to the style

of the hon. member for Albany in dealing with such questions as these. What I mean is this: nothing seems to give him greater delight than being able to show the seamy side of the colony. If he can only seize hold of something to show that we are in a bad condition, or, better still, in a condition bordering on insolvency, the hon. member seems to gloat over it. I think myself it should rather be a subject for sincere regret to us all, if there was real cause for alarm or distress—I think myself there is no cause for alarm or even of anxiety—and that in such cases it is our duty to try and discover the more hopeful features of our position. I think our ingenuity might be far more laudably exercised in endeavoring to discover what is bright and cheerful in our prospects, and to show that there lies behind this element of depression a foundation of solid prosperity. Although our exports have temporarily fallen off, there is a great deal in the colony's prospects which affords a subject for honest congratulation rather than for croaking, and for what is vulgarly termed "crying 'stinking fish.'" I think members, when they speak in this House should remember that their utterances do not stop here; and that, although perhaps not always very conspicuous members of this Assembly themselves, their words go forth to the world stamped with the impress of being the utterances of responsible politicians. Utterances like those of the hon. member for Albany are not likely to do us very much good, and—to use a phrase which has become very common this session—they are not patriotic. I think, myself, there is very much subject for congratulation in the history and the prospects of our country. Our exports of gold are splendid, I think, and the outlook in that direction is most hopeful, and I believe we have every reason to think that our exports under that head will still more increase. When we find an item of between £200,000 and £300,000 figuring among our exports, which had no place there at all a few years ago, there is something for sincere congratulation in it, and I think we are justly entitled to make the most of it, instead of suppressing the fact and magnifying those features of our condition which are perhaps to be deplored. There is one

matter that the Premier has pointed out which seems to some extent inexplicable, and that is the large proportion that our Customs revenue bears to our population. No doubt if we had been tampering with the tariff, and that had been the cause of this disproportion, there would have been cause for considerable anxiety as to whether we were not an overtaxed community. But, as it shows itself in the ordinary course of trade, we are bound to look for a solution of the question in some other direction. The way I think it can be accounted for is this: that we have had very considerable additions to our population in the shape of new arrivals, and no doubt, though there may have been many come with perhaps not much capital, yet all must have landed with a few pounds, some perhaps with hundreds, and possibly a few with thousands. People, when they travel about the world, do not carry their effects with them in bullion; and all this addition to our wealth must ultimately come through the Customs in some form or the other. These people will negotiate their drafts with merchants in the other colonies, and what they bring to this colony will find its way here in the shape of imports, which come through the Customs. I think this sufficiently accounts for the very large proportion our Customs revenue bears to our population. Otherwise, if we could not satisfactorily account for it in that way, it might, as I said, be a subject of some anxiety, for certainly it is rather out of proportion with what our taxation through the Customs ought to be. I do not think we are much more heavily taxed than the communities of the other colonies; if we were, it would be a serious subject for our consideration whether something could not be done to alleviate the position. The Premier seemed rather to regret in his Budget speech that land settlement did not keep pace with our Loan policy and the execution of public works and the extension of our railways. I think he is rather anticipating any ground for anxiety on this score, when he takes that view of the subject. I think what he said may be accounted for in this way: while the colony just now is in a state of considerable excitement on account of the gold fever and a vigorous public works policy, and, as a con-

sequence, wages are pretty high and employment is plentiful, it cannot be expected that the mere drudgery of cultivating the land can go on apace. It is only when people settle down into more habitual grooves that the cultivation of the soil will take its proper place amongst our other industries. At the same time we must remember that a great deal even is being done in that direction now, and I feel convinced, if we only have a little patience, and the lands now locked up are thrown open for selection, and our Land Regulations have time to bear their natural fruits in the settlement of the soil, we shall find a very large increase of agriculture to show, as well as progress in other directions. I may point out too that, ultimately, our goldfields population will contribute very largely towards that consummation. Many of these people, if successful in obtaining a large amount of gold, will ultimately, having got their full of gold-digging, turn their attention to the settlement and cultivation of the land. I do not intend to make any lengthened remarks upon this Budget Speech of the Premier's. I congratulate him upon being able to show what he did in our favor, and upon being equally frank in showing that there are certain matters which perhaps do not afford much subject for congratulation. No doubt it was a very ugly point he indicated when he showed the necessity for this very great expenditure in connection with our Eastern Railway. Still we knew it was coming. It has been hanging over our heads for years past. Yet, when it is about to burst upon us, it seems to come upon us with surprise; and it must be admitted it is a more formidable affair than we had anticipated. Still it must be tackled; and I think most members are convinced that, until these dreadful gradients are altered and our railways put on a different footing in other respects, there is little chance of their being a source of profit to us; and, until they are a source of profit to us, we cannot expect to reap their full benefit. I believe, if we get over the difficulty of these gradients, we shall have got over one of the most serious bars to our making any progress in that direction, and that when we do so we shall find our railways really beginning to pay.

I hope I shall be a true prophet, and that our railways will be capable of doing a great deal more than pay their working expenses, but contribute also towards paying the interest upon the liability incurred upon them. I trust that everything of a hopeful nature that the Premier has prognosticated will be fulfilled, and that some of his worst expectations will not be realised. Let us hope that a better season is likely to ensue at the North, and that this decrease in our export of wool is but temporary, and that next year we shall find it resume that prominence in our list of exports which it usually holds. There is one industry which the Premier has not referred to, but which I think gives every prospect of showing a great increase, and that is our timber trade. I believe the outside world is just waking up and beginning to realise what a splendid asset we have in our timber. There is a great and growing demand rising for it, both in London and even in America I believe, and there is every prospect that our jarrah—and, I hope, our karri too, where it can be used advantageously—will soon take a prominent place in the timber markets of the outside world. It is not at all impossible that we may find our timber exports perhaps figuring at half a million yet. If it does so, and our export of gold reaches a similar figure, and our wool the same, we shall then have some cause for congratulation. I think that in our timber we have a most valuable industry, and that anything which the Government can do to assist it in any way, either at Chicago or elsewhere, will be money well spent.

MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Canning,—I have pleasure in rising to congratulate the Colonial Treasurer upon the straightforward financial statement he placed before this House last night. I am not one of those who like "booming" statements. I object to an overdrawn picture or a sensational caricature of a country's prosperity or its prospects. I object, because I think exaggeration or inflation is an unwise basis to start from, an unwise foundation on which to build your premise. I object to financial statements of the "leaps and bounds" order. I much prefer the steady, solid, regular, and substantial progress indicated by the development of a country's resources, and



the establishment of its industries on a solid commercial basis. The Premier has had nothing very flowery or very showy to offer us beyond a £100,000 surplus; and, with the way I have heard hundreds of thousands spoken of lately in this House, I am beginning to think that hundreds of thousands are mere matters of detail, and of little or no consequence one way or the other. Still, when one calmly looks at these six figures in the newspaper, at breakfast next morning, they do begin to assume a little importance, especially when they are found on the right side of the public ledger, and more particularly when placed side by side with the financial statements we have been accustomed to look for lately from the other side of Australia, where we see no surpluses, but huge deficits—deficits that are growing larger year by year. I am sorry, sir, that in the financial statement of the Premier he thought it necessary to refer to that little bantling of his, the Homesteads Bill. I thought it had been decently and safely buried. So far as I understood the tone of the debate on that measure, there was no member of the House animated with less desire than the Premier himself to settle people on the soil, but our desire was to settle them in a way that would give them an opportunity of becoming commercial and financial successes. I think, perhaps, it would have been as well also if the reference to the Midland Railway proposals had been omitted from the Budget speech. But I am heartily in accord with the manly, upright, and statesmanlike utterances of the Premier with regard to that wretched creature—I don't know what else to call it—the Aborigines Protection Board. I heartily endorse every word of condemnation that was uttered with reference to that—fungus I call it—that has been allowed to grow on our public life. I think it should be cut away quickly and effectually by the operating knife of this House, backed up (as I am sure we should be) by the hearty support of the people of the country. It is a wretched, decrepid, tottering old remnant of—I don't know what; a sort of anchor which Downing-street put down to keep us loyal when the Constitutional painter was cut. It is so contemptible a thing that I will say no more about it, except that I

hope this House will distinctly and emphatically decline to pass an extra shilling for it. With regard to the remarks that fell this evening from the hon. member for Albany, I can only say that the whole speech was the nearest approach to the Book of Jeremiah I have heard for some time; in fact, it went farther than Jeremiah—it took us to Lamentations. It was a sort of *Hic jacet* over the remains of the colony, done to death and solemnly interred by the hon. member for Albany himself. When I heard it I began to think: "Surely I am living in a very wretched colony, a country that is rapidly falling into decay, that is in debt, that has incurred responsibilities it can never meet, a colony whose financial stability is discredited, in which nobody is any good, and in which life is not worth living." But when I heard the hon. member referring to midnight "lubrications"—I believe he meant something else—I could not help thinking that a little judicious lubrication, midnight or otherwise, applied to himself would possibly restore the hon. member to a better frame of mind and an improved state of health, and that the colony was not so bad after all. It occurred to me that, whatever might be thought about the hon. member himself, there was nothing hopeless about the prospects of the colony. It occurred to me that we could, in this colony, offer a future, as regards the development of natural industrial resources, that is unsurpassable—I may even say inapproachable—in any other part of Australia. We can show at the present moment, as the development of the last four years, in one industry alone, an absolute growth equal to one-fifth of the whole value of our export trade. That is the simple result of the development of only one of the natural resources of the colony, and one which four years ago had not been dreamt of. I am alluding to our gold-mining, which, though it only sprang into existence a short time ago, now tops our export trade. Surely that is a sufficient reply to Jeremiah. With regard to our land revenue, which the Premier regretted was not larger, I must say that there have been opportunities for making it much larger than it is, and I went out of my way to suggest to those responsible for our land revenue how that could be

done. I pointed out that there were opportunities of selling town lots within the limits of our goldfields which would have secured a very considerable amount of revenue, and at the same time confer a welcome boon upon those settled on those townsites. I know people who, not being able to purchase town lots, have erected on Crown land places worth £600 or £700, on the strength of the mere promise of the Warden that their rights would be maintained by the Government when the allotments were put up for sale. Of course the Government would not think of repudiating such a promise, but I consider that on Yilgarn and on the Murchison goldfields some £10,000 or £20,000 additional revenue might have accrued to our Land Department if those townships had been cut up and offered for sale, while at the same time it would have been a great convenience to the mining public. In the course of the debate on the Financial Statement last year I referred to a matter which may appear small in importance, but in regard to which I have repeatedly had applications made to me to endeavor to induce the Government to move in the matter. As I have said, it is a small matter, but very often in life small matters are sources of great trouble and inconvenience. A mosquito is a small thing in itself, but it can make life pretty miserable. Country settlers have often told me that it would be a useful thing, in country places especially, if postage stamps were also made available as revenue stamps, so far as receipts are concerned. I know it would be a very great convenience to many settlers in the back parts of the colony, and I hope the question, though a small one, may receive the attention of the Government. Then again, with regard to the telephone. I said last year that the telephone service, as conducted in this colony, was a weariness of the flesh. I have now had a year's added experience, and I now think it is something a little more than a weariness of the flesh,—it is the most wretched thing in the world. I tried the other day to get a message from a gentleman in a very high position, and I am sure if I heard the conversation of one I heard the conversation of nine people, one of whom was a lady, and that almost induced me to put the instrument down at

once. Seriously, I do not think our telephone service is what it ought to be. I hear very grave complaints about it from commercial men in the city. Our railway receipts are a matter I would not endeavor to deal with at this stage. They are rather beyond my comprehension in the form they are now made up. I think if these accounts were submitted to members they would find some difficulty in getting to the bottom of them. So far as I can understand, Government material conveyed from one department to another appears in these accounts as money made by the Railway Department. That appears to me very like taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another, and then taking credit for it. I think it would be wiser if the work done in the carrying of material from one Government department to another were kept distinctly apart from the work done for the general public, and paid for by the general public. So far as I can make out, the two things are now so mixed up that it is really impossible to say whether our railways are paying or not. I have no wish to reflect upon the hon. gentleman at the head of the department, who assured us the other day that he had many "sleepless nights" over this railway business. I have no wish to cause him any more sleepless nights. I am sure we all wish that the hon. gentleman should have his fair share of

"Tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep!"

But I do think it would be a wise thing, for the information of the public, if we had these railway accounts submitted to us in such a way as to show distinctly the amount of revenue that accrues from the mere transport of material from one department to another, and the amount of revenue that is derived from the commercial and the general public, for which cash is paid for services rendered. I referred, sir, last year to another matter in connection with these Estimates, and I see there has been a slight alteration made in the vote for next year. I refer to the Ecclesiastical Grant. Taking the amount of the grant for the first six months of this year, and comparing it with the amount of the grant for the first six months of next year, I find that the amount for this year was £1,771 9s., and that the amount for next year

is £1,771 9s. 11d. There is an increase of elevenpence! It is very trifling, but I cannot understand exactly how it is worked out. I expressed an opinion last year that the time had arrived in the history of this colony when it should be intimated to the heads of the various Churches that this Ecclesiastical Grant would disappear. I think so still. I did not suggest any drastic measure, to abolish it at once, but that it should be gently intimated to the various parties concerned that, if they wish to have Churches and be taught religion, they should put their hands in their pockets to pay for them, and that the State has no right to provide them with their religion. My idea was that the larger centres of population, like Perth and Fremantle, should be able to sustain their own Churches and their own ministers; and that the scattered country districts should get an intimation that the grant would disappear in a certain number of years. Thinking over the matter in a general way, I thought if we deducted 10 per cent. per annum from the grant, it would give these people to understand that the time was approaching when they will have to look after their own religion and their own Churches, if they want any. I have never heard the argument controverted that the State has any right to teach religion, and, perhaps, while on this subject, it would be as well I should point out in connection with this grant that, in addition to it, we paid last year £1,772 8s. towards the support of denominational schools. I take that also to be a grant to religion. I suppose these schools would not be established unless with the idea that those whom they belong to could use them for teaching their own religious tenets, while at the same time complying with the provisions of the present Education Act. The position then is this: looking at the allocation of the Ecclesiastical Grant—I am taking the figures for the six months—I find that the Church of England receives £1,002 2s. 3d.; the Roman Catholics, £504 5s. 10d.; the Wesleyans, £184 6s. 8d.; and the Presbyterians, £80 15s. 2d. But there is to be added to this distribution the amount of the grant-in-aid, given to the Denominational Schools, and this, to my mind, would result eventually in the Church of England receiving

as State aid to religion (still taking the figures for the six months) £1,144 6s. 3d.; the Roman Catholics, £2,134 5s. 10d.; the Wesleyans, £184 6s. 8d.; the Presbyterians, £80 15s. 2d.; and the Congregational Church, *nil*—that body, in a manly spirit of independence, declining to receive any State aid. There is another department appearing on these Estimates to which I desire to refer—the Crown Lands Department. With regard to that, all I wish now to say is that in my opinion the mining interest of the colony is not receiving that detailed attention it should do. I submit that the time has arrived when we should have a separate department or sub-department connected with mining, whose special province and duty it should be to look after the mining interests of the colony. Whether it would be wise to include an agricultural department I am not prepared to say; but there is not the shadow of a doubt in my mind that we require a separate mining department. We now look to mining as one of the main industries of the colony, and I do not think it would hurt us if we gave it every opportunity of extending its boundary. Another item to which I wish to refer is our Printing Department. There is no doubt that our printing work, as turned out, is a work of art—too much of a work of art, to my mind, considerably. The *Government Gazette*—it is a small matter, but it is indicative of larger matters—comes out on too good a paper, and is printed in too costly a way. Not only that: I believe that if a careful analysis were made of the work remaining in this department, it would be found that the department is twelve months behind time with a great deal of its work. I believe a good deal of the work done by this department could be done by private contract. Just to give an idea of the way the work is behind: there is not a mining-right form, in proper form, on any goldfield in this colony, to be issued by the Warden. There is not a copy of the Mining Regulations to be had on any goldfield by purchase from the Warden. This is not a matter of to-day or yesterday; it has existed for the last two years. I know a case lately where the very Warden himself had to borrow a copy of the Regulations from a miner. I have also been informed by legal gentle-

men in Perth that they actually cannot get the Statutes of the colony when they want them. because the work of the department is so much behind; and I know, from matters that have occurred in this House this session, we cannot even get official returns printed. For instance, there is the report of the Government Geologist on the Murchison Goldfields, which has been in possession of the Government for the last three months, and which the public are very anxious to see. But we cannot get it. The same thing applies to the Government Geologist's report on the Tinfields; it took the Government three months to publish it. This must be due to the Printing Department being overworked, and, as I said just now, I think a great deal of the work that is now cast on this department would be better done by public or private contract. I do not intend to make any further reference to these Estimates at present. Taking the financial statement of the Premier as a whole, I congratulate him, and I congratulate the Government, and I congratulate the country on having had placed before it such a satisfactory statement of affairs to sit down to at Christmas time. Looking at it all round, I think it indicates increased commercial progress. We have had to face an unprecedented drought. Last year our wool exports figured at £436,000; this year it will amount (so far as I can learn) to about £200,000. But another industry has in the meantime come to the front—gold—which will bring up the sum total to nearly the same amount; and I think we have cause for congratulation upon that most encouraging fact. I again congratulate the Premier and the Ministry upon the gratifying statement of affairs they are able to submit to this House and the country. Last night the Premier thanked the House and the country for the general and generous support they had given to the present Ministry. If I may be permitted to say so, so far as I understand the tone and spirit of the House, there has never been any criticism of the actions of the Government that was simply intended as captious criticism. There has been honest criticism and honest opposition as to the means proposed, but not as to the object in view; and I think if the Treasury bench were not quite so easily "drawn," if perhaps they had

exhibited a little more good temper when under the fire of honest criticism, they would have had a very much pleasanter time of it than even they have had. Sir, I think, taking it altogether, that the Ministry and the country are to be congratulated on the Christmas fare presented to us in the Premier's Financial Statement for 1892.

Item—*His Excellency the Governor*, £373 10s.—put and passed.

*Legislative Council*, £650 :

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved that progress be now reported, and leave given to sit again. He did not think members had had enough time to look into these Estimates yet; they were only laid on the table last night. There were several things he wanted to inquire into, and he should challenge every item if the Government insisted upon going on with them now. It was an unprecedented proceeding.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he had no objection to report progress, but he thought they might get through a few of the items that evening. The early parts of these Estimates were simply departmental, and there was scarcely any increase, nearly all the items being the same as last year. They were very easily mastered; but it seemed to him the hon. member did not want to master them. The hon. member seemed to enjoy coming there every evening and have his club at the House, but there were other people who wanted to get through the work, having other duties to perform. If there were any items which the hon. member wished explained, he was prepared to offer any explanation the hon. member might require. At the same time the Government, in a matter of this sort at any rate, in the matter of the Estimates, wished to meet the convenience of hon. members. It was for the House to say whether it wished to go on or not.

Question put—That progress be now reported.

The committee divided, with the following result:—

Ayes ...	...	...	9
Noes ...	...	...	17
<hr/>			
Majority against ...			8

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Darlôt	Mr. Baker
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Burt
Mr. Loton	Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Monger	Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. Paterson	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Hassell
Mr. H. W. Sholl	Mr. Marmion
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Molloy
Mr. R. F. Sholl (Teller).	Mr. Pearse
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Solomon
	Sir J. G. Lee Steere
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. A. Forrest (Teller).

Question—That progress be now reported—put and negatived.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed there was an increase of £100 proposed in the salary of the Clerk of the Legislative Council, making it £300. Considering that the House only met for about two months in the year, he did not think that official—though he believed he was a very efficient officer—was at present underpaid, if he got £200 for two months' work. He moved that the item be reduced by £50.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that under the Constitution Act the corresponding officers of both Houses of Parliament had to be paid the same salary, and members would notice, lower down, that the Government proposed to give the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly the same increase. Both these officers were now receiving £200 a year. The office was a very important one, he thought he might say a most important one. It was one that in the other colonies, and in all countries, was paid at a considerable rate. In New South Wales the Clerks of the two Houses received £1,000 a year each; in Victoria he believed they received about the same, and in no other colony in Australia did they receive less than £450. It was all very well for members to say that Parliament only met a short time during the year; he did not think that had much to do with it. It was the importance of the office they had to look to, and they must remember too that there was a great deal of work to be done after the House prorogued. There were all the records to be got together and printed, there were the "Votes and Proceedings" to be arranged, and there was also the correspondence between the Houses of Parliament here and those of all the other Australian colonies to be attended to.

He thought he might safely say that even at the present time these officers were kept fairly at work throughout the whole year, and the work was likely to increase as time went on. He was sure that House did not desire to see any of its officers underpaid; in fact, he did not think they desired them, if they could help it, to seek elsewhere in order to have sufficient incomes to live upon; but that must be the case if they were to keep them on a salary of £200 a year. The Government had carefully considered the matter; it had been brought under their notice by those who were in responsible positions fixed by that House, and they had decided that the time had arrived when these two officers, holding the very important position they did, should receive £300 a year. It was very little, after all, for gentlemen who had to perform the duties these officers had to perform, who had to be acquainted with the rules of the House, and were looked upon as a guide in all matters of Parliamentary procedure. In the other colonies, the Clerks of Parliament were really the referees upon all questions relating to the rules of procedure, and their services were of the greatest assistance to members. He was glad to say we had as clerks of our two Houses here gentlemen who took great interest in their work, and who devoted themselves to their work, and, if not already fully conversant with all the rules and procedure of Parliament and the rules of debate, were fast becoming so, and, he thought, were of great assistance to hon. members. He would ask members not to deal with this matter of its own officers in anything but the most liberal spirit.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said it was all very well for the Premier to quote the salaries paid in the other colonies. In the other colonies Parliament was in session for six or seven months in the year, whereas here the Houses only sat a couple of months, and he thought £200 was not bad pay for two months, for all these officers had to do. When the work increased, and the sessions of Parliament occupied a longer period, it would be time enough then to ask for this increase.

MR. LOTON did not think that under all the circumstances the salary put down for these officers could be looked upon as excessive. As a rule he was generally

opposed to increases of salary, but he thought this increase was not undeserved. As to the time during which our Parliament was in session, it had been in session nearly five months this year. They sat until the middle of March, and they commenced again early in November, and were likely to go on until the middle of January at least; and the Houses would meet again in July. It must be remembered that while they were dealing with the salary of the Clerk of the Council they were also dealing with the Clerk of their own House, and, though possibly the duties of the former were not quite so heavy, still they were equally important. He thought the House would do well to pass this vote.

MR. A. FORREST thought the Government were only doing justice to the Clerks of both Houses of Parliament in giving them this increase. He believed it was promised last year, more especially in the case of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, who, he believed, was receiving less salary than he had been receiving in another branch of the service. He did not think £300 a year was at all too much to pay gentlemen occupying the position these gentlemen occupied; in fact he did not see how they could keep up their position on £300 a year.

Question (that the item be reduced by £50) put and negatived.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he also noticed an increase of £50 in the salary of the *Hansard* reporter in the Legislative Council. He moved that the item be reduced by that amount. He thought £150 a year for two months' work was very good pay indeed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this increase was in accordance with the recommendation of the Joint Standing Orders Committee last session, and agreed to by the House. The salaries of all the *Hansard* reporters were based upon that report of last session, when the staff was reorganised—£200 for the Council, and £600 for the Assembly.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Then I do not object to them.

Question—That the item be reduced by £50—put and negatived.

Item agreed to, and vote put and passed.

*Legislative Assembly*, £1,265 :

Put and passed, without comment.

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved that progress be now reported, and leave asked to sit again.

Agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again on Thursday, 5th January, 1893.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER THE CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he understood it was the wish of hon. members that the House at its rising should adjourn over the Christmas and New Year's holidays. Members were aware that his Honor the Speaker and himself had been appointed members of the Federal Council, which was to meet at Hobart on the 26th January, and, if possible, they desired to be present on that date, if the business here admitted of it. If not, then, so far as he was concerned, he proposed to remain here until the business of the country was completed, or, at any rate, all the important business. He thought if the House re-assembled, after the holidays, about the 5th January, they might probably get through the work by the 13th, when his Honor and himself would have to leave for Hobart, if the business could be got through by that time. He therefore moved that the House, at its rising, adjourn until Thursday, 5th January.

Agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at half-past 10 o'clock p.m., until Thursday, 5th January.